

STABILITIES OF THE GENERALIZED MIXED WIDTH AND DUAL MIXED RADIAL INEQUALITIES

HENGFANG QIU AND DEYAN ZHANG*

(Communicated by T. Burić)

Abstract. In this note, stability properties of the generalized mixed width inequality and the generalized dual mixed radial inequality are obtained in the Hausdorff distance, L_2 -metric and the dual L_2 -metric, respectively.

1. Introduction

There are many important geometric inequalities, for example, the classical isoperimetric inequality, the reverse isoperimetric inequality, the Aleksandrov-Fenchel inequality, etc.. It is well known that stabilities of these geometric inequalities have been extensively investigated, see [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9]. Roughly speaking, these investigations focus on the geometric implications if the inequalities are in a certain sense close equalities. For more information of the stability problem one may consult [2, 5]. An inequality in convex geometry can be written

$$\Phi(K) \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Phi: \mathcal{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real valued function and (1.1) is supposed to hold for all $K \in \mathcal{C}^n$. Let \mathcal{C}_Φ^n denote those elements $K \in \mathcal{C}^n$ for which the equality sign in (1.1) holds, i.e., $\Phi(K) = 0$ for all $K \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi^n$.

We are interested in the stability problem associated with geometric inequalities of type (1.1). That means, we ask if K must be close to a member of \mathcal{C}_Φ^n whenever $\Phi(K)$ is close to zero. In order to give a precise formulation of this problem, it is necessary for us to be given a measurement function $g: \mathcal{C}^n \times \mathcal{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that describes in some sense the deviation between two convex bodies. Function g should satisfy following conditions:

- (i) $g(K, L) \geq 0$ for all $K, L \in \mathcal{C}^n$;
- (ii) $g(K, L) = 0$ if and only if $K = L$.

Mathematics subject classification (2010): 52A38, 52A40.

Keywords and phrases: k -order width function, k -order radial function, Hausdorff distance, L_2 -metric, dual L_2 -metric.

* Corresponding author

This work is supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Anhui Province (No. 1908085MA05), the University Natural Science Research Project of Anhui Province (No. KJ2019A0590) and Excellent Young Talents Fund Program of Higher Education Institutions of Anhui Province (No. gxyqZD2020022).

If Φ , \mathcal{C}_Φ^n and g are given, the stability problem associated with the geometric inequality (1.1) can now be formulated as follows:

Find positive constants c, α with property that whenever

$$\Phi(K) \leq \varepsilon$$

(for some $\varepsilon \geq 0$), then there exists an $L \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi^n$ such that

$$g(K, L) \leq c\varepsilon^\alpha.$$

Or equivalently, find positive constants c, α with property that for each $K \in \mathcal{C}^n$, there exists an $L \in \mathcal{C}_\Phi^n$ (L may depend on K) such that

$$\Phi(K) \geq cg(K, L)^\alpha.$$

A bounded convex subset in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n is said to be an n -dimensional convex body if it is closed and has interior points. Let \mathcal{C}^n denote the class of all n -dimensional convex bodies. If $n = 2$, a 2-dimensional convex body is usually called a convex domain. Let K be a convex domain with area $A(K)$ and width function $\omega(K, \theta)$. In 1969, Chernoff [1] proved an inequality that says

$$A(K) \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \omega(K, \theta) \omega\left(K, \theta + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) d\theta,$$

where the equality holds if and only if K is a disc. In 2010, Ou-Pan in [8] introduced the k -order width function $\omega_k(K, \theta)$ by

$$\omega_k(K, \theta) = H(K, \theta) + H\left(K, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + \dots + H\left(K, \theta + \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k}\right), \quad k \geq 2,$$

where $H(K, \theta)$ is the support function of K . By the k -order width function $\omega_k(K, \theta)$, Ou-Pan got the following Chernoff-Ou-Pan inequality

$$A(K) \leq \frac{1}{k} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{k}} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k\left(K, \theta + \frac{\pi}{k}\right) d\theta, \tag{1.2}$$

and the equality holds if and only if K is a disc.

Moreover, for two convex domains K and L , Mao-Yang [7] got the generalized mixed width inequality that states

$$\sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \leq \frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta, \tag{1.3}$$

and the equality holds if and only if K and L are discs.

Let P be a planar star body with area $A(P)$ and radial function $\rho(P, \theta)$, Zhang-Yang in [12] introduced the k -order radial function $\rho_k(P, \theta)$ by

$$\rho_k(P, \theta) = \rho(P, \theta) + \rho\left(P, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + \dots + \rho\left(P, \theta + \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k}\right), \quad k \geq 2.$$

By the k -order radial function $\rho_k(P, \theta)$, Zhang-Yang obtained the following dual Chernoff-Ou-Pan inequality

$$A(P) \geq \frac{1}{k} \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{k}} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k\left(P, \theta + \frac{\pi}{k}\right) d\theta, \tag{1.4}$$

where the equality holds if and only if the radial function $\rho(P, \theta)$ of P is of the form

$$\rho(P, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_{2nk} \cos 2nk\theta + d_{2nk} \sin 2nk\theta).$$

Moreover, for two planar star bodies P and Q , Mao-Yang [7] got the generalized dual mixed radial inequality that states

$$\sqrt{A(P)A(Q)} \geq \frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta, \tag{1.5}$$

and the equality holds if and only if the radial functions of P and Q have the same form

$$\rho(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_{nk} \cos nk\theta + d_{nk} \sin nk\theta).$$

In this note we will focus our attention on stabilities of the generalized mixed width inequality (1.3) in the Hausdorff distance, the L_2 -metric and the generalized dual mixed radial inequality (1.5) in the dual L_2 -metric, respectively.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we will first recall some basic facts about plane convex geometry which will be used later on. Let $K \in \mathcal{C}^2$ be a convex domain and assume that the origin O of \mathbb{R}^2 lies in the interior of K , and let \mathbf{u} be a unit vector in \mathbb{R}^2 and $l(\mathbf{u})$ denote the supporting line of K that is perpendicular to \mathbf{u} and on the same side of the origin. The oriented distance from O to $l(\mathbf{u})$, denoted by $H(K, \mathbf{u})$, is called the Minkowski support function of K . Since \mathbf{u} is usually determined by the oriented angle, say θ , from the positive x -axis to \mathbf{u} , one also writes $H(K, \theta)$ instead of $H(K, \mathbf{u})$. It is clear that $H(K, \theta)$ is a continuous 2π -periodic function. A more comprehensive introduction to the theory of convex bodies can be found in [11].

Let $p(K)$ denote the perimeter and $A(K)$ the area of K , one can find (see [5]),

$$p(K) = \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta) d\theta, \tag{2.1}$$

and if H is sufficiently smooth, then

$$A(K) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} (H^2(K, \theta) - H'^2(K, \theta)) d\theta, \tag{2.2}$$

where $'$ denotes the derivative with respect to θ .

The Steiner disc of K , denoted by $S(K)$, is the disc with radius $p(K)/2\pi$ and center at the Steiner point which can be defined in terms of the Minkowski support function

$$\vec{s}(K) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathbf{u}(\theta)H(K, \theta)d\theta. \tag{2.3}$$

The Steiner disc of K will play a role in our stability statement in Section 3 below. For more information on the Steiner point of a convex body one may consult [10].

The width of K in a direction $\mathbf{u}(\theta) = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$, denoted by $\omega(K, \theta)$, is defined to be the distance between two tangents to a perpendicular to $\mathbf{u}(\theta)$. It is clear that

$$\omega(K, \theta) = H(K, \theta) + H(K, \theta + \pi).$$

The convex domain K is said to be of constant width if its width in any direction is a positive constant ω_0 , i.e., $\omega(K, \theta) = H(K, \theta) + H(K, \theta + \pi) = \omega_0$ for any $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. For a convex domain K , Ou-Pan [8] introduced the k -order width function $\omega_k(K, \theta)$ by

$$\omega_k(K, \theta) = H(K, \theta) + H\left(K, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + \dots + H\left(K, \theta + \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k}\right), \quad k \geq 2.$$

We wish to express $p(K), \vec{s}(K), A(K)$ in terms of the Fourier coefficients of $H(K, \theta)$. Since the support function of a given convex domain K is always continuous, bounded and 2π -periodic, it has a Fourier series of the form

$$H(K, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n \cos n\theta + b_n \sin n\theta),$$

where

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta)d\theta,$$

$$a_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta) \cos n\theta d\theta, \quad b_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta) \sin n\theta d\theta, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Differentiation of this with respect to θ gives us

$$H'(K, \theta) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(-a_n \sin n\theta + b_n \cos n\theta).$$

From (2.1) and (2.3), it follows immediately that

$$p(K) = \pi a_0, \tag{2.4}$$

$$\vec{s}(K) = (a_1, b_1). \tag{2.5}$$

By the Parseval equality, one can get

$$\int_0^{2\pi} H^2(K, \theta)d\theta = \frac{1}{2} \pi a_0^2 + \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n^2 + b_n^2),$$

$$\int_0^{2\pi} H'^2(K, \theta) d\theta = \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 (a_n^2 + b_n^2),$$

which together with (2.2) gives us

$$A(K) = \frac{1}{4} \pi a_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} \pi \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 1) (a_n^2 + b_n^2). \tag{2.6}$$

Let S^{n-1} be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , a compact subset P of \mathbb{R}^n be star-shaped with respect to the origin, for $\mathbf{u} \in S^{n-1}$, its radial function $\rho(P, \mathbf{u})$ is defined by

$$\rho(P, \mathbf{u}) = \max\{\lambda > 0 : \lambda \mathbf{u} \in P\}.$$

Since \mathbf{u} is usually determined by the oriented angle, say θ , from the positive x -axis to \mathbf{u} , one also writes $\rho(P, \theta)$ instead of $\rho(P, \mathbf{u})$. It is clear that $\rho(P, \theta)$ is a continuous 2π -periodic function. For a planar star body P , Zhang-Yang [12] introduced the k -order radial function $\rho_k(P, \theta)$ by

$$\rho_k(P, \theta) = \rho(P, \theta) + \rho\left(P, \theta + \frac{2\pi}{k}\right) + \dots + \rho\left(P, \theta + \frac{2(k-1)\pi}{k}\right), \quad k \geq 2, \quad \theta \in [0, 2\pi].$$

For a planar star body P , its area $A(P)$ can be expressed by

$$A(P) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho^2(P, \theta) d\theta. \tag{2.7}$$

Since $\rho(P, \theta)$ is continuous, bounded and 2π -periodic, it has a Fourier series of the form

$$\rho(P, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n \cos n\theta + d_n \sin n\theta), \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$c_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(P, \theta) d\theta,$$

$$c_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(P, \theta) \cos n\theta d\theta, \quad d_n = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho(P, \theta) \sin n\theta d\theta, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

We will express $A(P)$ in terms of the Fourier coefficients of $\rho(P, \theta)$. By the Parseval equality and (2.8), we get

$$A(P) = \frac{1}{4} \pi c_0^2 + \frac{1}{2} \pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^2 + d_n^2).$$

For the star body P , if its radial function

$$\rho(P, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n \cos n\theta + d_n \sin n\theta)$$

satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}c_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (c_{kl} \cos kl\theta + d_{kl} \sin kl\theta) > 0,$$

then we can define a star body \tilde{P} associated with P by

$$\rho(\tilde{P}, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}c_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (c_{kl} \cos kl\theta + d_{kl} \sin kl\theta). \tag{2.9}$$

The star body \tilde{P} associated with P will play a role in our stability statement in Section 4 below.

3. Stability properties of the generalized mixed width inequality

Let K and L be two convex domains with support functions $H(K, \theta)$ and $H(L, \theta)$ respectively, the most frequently used function to measure the deviation between K and L is the Hausdorff distance

$$h(K, L) = \max_{\theta} |H(K, \theta) - H(L, \theta)|.$$

Another such measure with respect to stability problem is the L_2 -metric, which is defined by

$$h_2(K, L) = \left(\int_0^{2\pi} |H(K, \theta) - H(L, \theta)|^2 d\theta \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is obvious that $h(K, L) = 0$ (or $h_2(K, L) = 0$) if and only if $K = L$.

We consider now stabilities of the generalized mixed width inequality (1.3) with respect to the deviation measures h_2 and h .

THEOREM 3.1. *Let K, L be two convex domains with areas $A(K)$ and $A(L)$ respectively. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $k \geq 2$, then*

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \geq h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)), \tag{3.1}$$

and the equality (3.1) holds if and only if K and L are discs, where $S(K)$ and $S(L)$ are the Steiner discs of K and L , respectively.

Proof. Since the support function $H(K, \theta)$ of the convex domain K has the following Fourier series

$$H(K, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} p(K) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n^K \cos n\theta + b_n^K \sin n\theta),$$

where

$$a_n^K = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta) \cos n\theta d\theta, \quad b_n^K = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} H(K, \theta) \sin n\theta d\theta, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$$

and the support function of $S(K)$ is

$$H(S(K), \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi}p(K) + a_1^K \cos \theta + b_1^K \sin \theta.$$

By using Parseval’s equality one can obtain

$$h_2(K, S(K)) = \left(\int_0^{2\pi} |H(K, \theta) - H(S(K), \theta)|^2 d\theta \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{\pi \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2})}. \quad (3.2)$$

Similarly, one has

$$h_2(L, S(L)) = \left(\int_0^{2\pi} |H(L, \theta) - H(S(L), \theta)|^2 d\theta \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{\pi \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2})}. \quad (3.3)$$

By the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [7], it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}A(L) \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 1) \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}(a_n^{L^2} + b_n^{L^2}) \right] + \pi \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (a_{kl}^K a_{kl}^L + b_{kl}^K b_{kl}^L). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}A(L) \\ & \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 2) \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}(a_n^{L^2} + b_n^{L^2}) \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left[\left(\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}a_n^{K^2} + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}a_n^{L^2} \right) + \left(\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}b_n^{K^2} + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}b_n^{L^2} \right) \right] - \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (|2a_{kl}^K a_{kl}^L| + |2b_{kl}^K b_{kl}^L|) \\ & \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 2) \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}(a_n^{L^2} + b_n^{L^2}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which together with (3.2) and (3.3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}A(L) \\ & \geq \pi \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2}) \right] \\ & \geq 2\sqrt{\pi \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2})} \sqrt{\pi \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2})} \\ & = 2h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta &\geq \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K}A(K) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L}A(L) + 2h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)) \\ &\geq 2\sqrt{A(K)A(L)} + 2h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \geq h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)),$$

and the equality holds if and only if K and L are discs. \square

THEOREM 3.2. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 3.1, one gets*

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta)\omega_k(L, \theta)d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \geq \frac{2\pi}{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)} h(K, S(K))h(L, S(L)), \tag{3.5}$$

and the equality holds if K and L are discs.

Proof. Since it is easily see that

$$|a_n \cos n\theta + b_n \sin n\theta| \leq \sqrt{a_n^2 + b_n^2},$$

one can get

$$\begin{aligned} &|H(K, \theta) - H(S(K), \theta)| \\ &= \left| \frac{1}{2}a_0^K + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n^K \cos n\theta + b_n^K \sin n\theta) - \left(\frac{1}{2}a_0^K + a_1^K \cos \theta + b_1^K \sin \theta \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |a_n^K \cos n\theta + b_n^K \sin n\theta| \leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sqrt{a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$|H(L, \theta) - H(S(L), \theta)| \leq \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \sqrt{a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2}}.$$

It follows from the Hölder inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} h(K, S(K)) &\leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sqrt{a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 - 2} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 2)(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$h(L, S(L)) \leq \left(\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^2 - 2} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (m^2 - 2)(a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2}) \right]^{1/2}. \tag{3.7}$$

Recall that if q is not an integer by Fourier series calculation,

$$\pi \cot q\pi = \frac{1}{q} - 2q \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 - q^2}.$$

Furthermore, one can calculate

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2 - 2} = \frac{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)}{4}.$$

It follows from (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} A(L) \\ & \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 2)(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2}) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (m^2 - 2)(a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2}) \right] \\ & \geq \pi \sqrt{\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} (n^2 - 2)(a_n^{K^2} + b_n^{K^2})} \sqrt{\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (m^2 - 2)(a_m^{L^2} + b_m^{L^2})} \\ & \geq \frac{4\pi}{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)} h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta \\ & \geq \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} A(K) + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} A(L) + \frac{4\pi}{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)} h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)) \\ & \geq 2\sqrt{A(K)A(L)} + \frac{4\pi}{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)} h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \geq \frac{2\pi}{5 - \sqrt{2}\pi \cot(\sqrt{2}\pi)} h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)),$$

and the equality holds if K and L are discs. \square

REMARK. (i) Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 can be looked upon as strengthened forms of the generalized mixed width inequality (1.3).

(ii) Observe that although (3.1) cannot be improved for all $K, L \in \mathcal{C}^2$, it is possible to prove stronger inequalities for particular kinds of convex domains. For example, if K, L are of constant width, the Fourier expression of the support functions of K and L

have the properties that $a_{2n}^K = a_{2m}^L = b_{2n}^K = b_{2m}^L = 0$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Checking the proof of (3.1),

$$h_2(K, S(K)) = \sqrt{\pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2},$$

$$h_2(L, S(L)) = \sqrt{\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (a_{2m+1}^L)^2 + b_{2m+1}^L)^2}.$$

It follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} A(L) \\ & \geq \frac{7\pi}{2} \left[\frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2 + \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (a_{2m+1}^L)^2 + b_{2m+1}^L)^2 \right] \\ & \geq 7 \sqrt{\pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2} \sqrt{\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (a_{2m+1}^L)^2 + b_{2m+1}^L)^2} \\ & = 7h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} \geq \frac{7}{2} h_2(K, S(K))h_2(L, S(L)),$$

and the equality holds if and only if K and L are discs.

Similarly, (3.5) can also be strengthened in this case. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & |H(K, \theta) - H(S(K), \theta)| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{(a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2} \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2 - 2} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((2n+1)^2 - 2)(a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ & < \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4n^2 + 4n - 3} \right)^{1/2} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((2n+1)^2 - 2)(a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ & = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((2n+1)^2 - 2)(a_{2n+1}^K)^2 + b_{2n+1}^K)^2 \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can get

$$|H_L(\theta) - H_{S(L)}(\theta)| < \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} ((2m+1)^2 - 2)(a_{2m+1}^L)^2 + b_{2m+1}^L)^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

It follows from (3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} A(K) - \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} A(L) \\ & \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((2n+1)^2 - 2) \frac{a_0^L}{a_0^K} (a_{2n+1}^K{}^2 + b_{2n+1}^K{}^2) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} ((2m+1)^2 - 2) \frac{a_0^K}{a_0^L} (a_{2m+1}^L{}^2 + b_{2m+1}^L{}^2) \right] \\ & \geq \pi \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((2n+1)^2 - 2) (a_{2n+1}^K{}^2 + b_{2n+1}^K{}^2)} \sqrt{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} ((2m+1)^2 - 2) (a_{2m+1}^L{}^2 + b_{2m+1}^L{}^2)} \\ & > 3\pi h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \omega_k(K, \theta) \omega_k(L, \theta) d\theta - \sqrt{A(K)A(L)} > \frac{3\pi}{2} h(K, S(K)) h(L, S(L)).$$

4. Stability property of the generalized dual mixed radial inequality

Let P and Q be two planar star bodies with radial functions $\rho(P, \theta)$ and $\rho(Q, \theta)$ respectively, similar to L_2 -metric, the dual L_2 -metric between P and Q can be defined by

$$\delta_2(P, Q) = \left(\int_0^{2\pi} |\rho(P, \theta) - \rho(Q, \theta)|^2 d\theta \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is obvious that $\delta_2(P, Q) = 0$ if and only if $P = Q$.

We consider now the stability of the generalized dual mixed radial inequality (1.5) with respect to the deviation measure δ_2 .

THEOREM 4.1. *Let P, Q be two planar star bodies with areas $A(P)$ and $A(Q)$ respectively. If \tilde{P}, \tilde{Q} are star bodies associated with P and Q , respectively. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $k \geq 2$, then*

$$A(P)A(Q) - \left(\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \delta_2(P, \tilde{P})^2 \delta_2(Q, \tilde{Q})^2, \tag{4.1}$$

and the equality holds if and only if P and Q are discs.

Proof. We assume that $\rho(P, \theta)$ and $\rho(Q, \theta)$ have the following Fourier series

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(P, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} c_0^P + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^P \cos n\theta + d_n^P \sin n\theta), \\ \rho(Q, \theta) &= \frac{1}{2} c_0^Q + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^Q \cos n\theta + d_n^Q \sin n\theta), \end{aligned}$$

then areas $A(P)$ and $A(Q)$ follow from (2.7) and (2.8) that

$$A(P) = \frac{1}{4}\pi c_0^{P2} + \frac{1}{2}\pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}), \quad A(Q) = \frac{1}{4}\pi c_0^{Q2} + \frac{1}{2}\pi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}).$$

Similarly, by the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [7], it follows that

$$\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{4}\pi c_0^P c_0^Q + \frac{1}{2}\pi \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (c_{kl}^P c_{kl}^Q + d_{kl}^P d_{kl}^Q).$$

By using Parseval's equality one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_2(P, \tilde{P})^2 &= \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \rho(P, \theta) - \rho(\tilde{P}, \theta) \right|^2 d\theta = \pi \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}), \\ \delta_2(Q, \tilde{Q})^2 &= \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \rho(Q, \theta) - \rho(\tilde{Q}, \theta) \right|^2 d\theta = \pi \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &A(P)A(Q) - \left(\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{8}\pi^2 c_0^{P2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}) + \frac{1}{8}\pi^2 c_0^{Q2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}) \\ &- \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 c_0^P c_0^Q \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (c_{kl}^P c_{kl}^Q + d_{kl}^P d_{kl}^Q) - \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 \left[\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (c_{kl}^P c_{kl}^Q + d_{kl}^P d_{kl}^Q) \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &A(P)A(Q) - \left(\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta \right)^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{8}\pi^2 c_0^{P2} \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}) + \frac{1}{8}\pi^2 c_0^{Q2} \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}) \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{P2} + d_n^{P2}) \sum_{n \neq kl}^{\infty} (c_n^{Q2} + d_n^{Q2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\delta_2(P, \tilde{P})^2 \delta_2(Q, \tilde{Q})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$A(P)A(Q) - \left(\frac{1}{2k^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \rho_k(P, \theta) \rho_k(Q, \theta) d\theta \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}\delta_2(P, \tilde{P})^2 \delta_2(Q, \tilde{Q})^2,$$

and the equality holds if and only if P and Q are discs. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] P. R. CHERNOFF, *An area-width inequality for convex curves*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 1969, 76 (1): 34–35.
- [2] B. FUGLEDE, *Stability in the isoperimetric problem*, Bull. London Math. Soc., 1986, 18: 599–605.
- [3] X. GAO, *A new reverse isoperimetric inequality and its stability*, Math. Inequal. Appl., 2012, 15 (3): 733–743.
- [4] L. GAO & Y. L. WANG, *Stability properties of the generalized Chernoff inequality*, Math. Inequal. Appl., 2012, 15 (2): 281–287.
- [5] H. GROEMER, *Stability properties of geometric inequalities*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 1990, 97 (5): 382–394.
- [6] H. GROEMER & R. SCHNEIDER, *Stability estimates for some geometric inequalities*, Bull. London Math. Soc., 1991, 23: 67–74.
- [7] Y. Y. MAO & Y. L. YANG, *A generalized mixed width inequality and a generalized dual mixed radial inequality*, Results Math., 2019, 74: 123–134.
- [8] K. OU & S. L. PAN, *Some remarks about closed convex curves*, Pacific J. Math., 2010, 248 (2): 393–401.
- [9] S. L. PAN & H. P. XU, *Stability of a reverse isoperimetric inequality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 2009, 350: 348–353.
- [10] R. SCHNEIDER, *On Steiner points of convex bodies*, Israel J. Math., 1971, 9: 241–249.
- [11] R. SCHNEIDER, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, Second expanded edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [12] D. Y. ZHANG & Y. L. YANG, *The dual generalized Chernoff inequality for star-shaped curves*, Turkish J. Math., 2016, 40 (2): 272–282.

(Received December 17, 2019)

Hengfang Qiu
School of Mathematics Sciences
Huaibei Normal University
Huaibei, 235000, P. R. China
e-mail: qhfang2018@126.com

Deyan Zhang
School of Mathematics Sciences
Huaibei Normal University
Huaibei, 235000, P. R. China
e-mail: zhangdy8005@126.com